

REMARKS

The Office Communication alleges that the Amendment filed July 28, 2005, was non-responsive to the Office Action of February 28, 2005, for not pointing out the distinctions of the newly presented claims. In view of applicants thorough explanation of the distinctions of the new claims in the Amendment, applicant's attorney contacted the Examiner in order to ascertain the reason for the present Office Communication.

During a brief telephone conversation the Examiner indicated that he was under the impression that applicant merely argued the now cancelled claim 1 in the Remarks section of the Amendment. Applicant's attorney indicated that this was not the case, that the features of the new claims were specifically argued as discussed below, and that the cancelled claim was referred to because the applied art failed to show features common to both the cancelled claim and the new claims. In view of the Examiner's reading of the prior art and claim 1, and possible application of the prior art to the new claims, it was felt that the grounds of rejection could only be adequately addressed based on correlation of the grounds presented in the Office Action with regard to claim 1, with the corresponding rephrased subject matter of new claim 2. The failure of the prior art to teach the claimed subject matter dictates that the next action not be made final.

In the Remarks of the Amendment, the failure of the prior art to teach subject matter of claim 1, to which it was applied, is discussed on pages 10-11.

Correspondence of the subject matter of claim 1 to claim 2 is established and the distinctions of claim 2 are specifically related beginning at the last two lines of page 2 and throughout the remainder of the remarks. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner carefully review the distinctions of claim 2, discussed on pages 12-14, and the details of the functioning of device of the prior art reference which are considerably different from those of the present invention.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Amendment was fully responsive to the Office Action and that the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Jordan and Hamburg LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants

by and,

By Herbert F. Ruschmann
Herbert F. Ruschmann
Reg. No. 35,341
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340